

| | | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i> | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/029,425 | MULLER, RUDOLF | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jermie E. Cozart | 3726 | |

All Participants:

(1) Jermie E. Cozart.

(2) Eugene Rzucidlo.

Status of Application: allowed

(3) James Morgan.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2008

Time: 9:30AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential rejection of claims 1 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (5,502,888) in view of Capuano (4,389,766).

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 39, and 41

Prior art documents discussed:

Takahashi et al. (5,502,888) and Capuano (4,389,766)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During a telephone conversation with Eugene Rzucidlo and James Morgan, participants discussed the differences between the Takahashi and Capuano references and how the aforementioned references do not render the claimed invention obvious. Claims 1 and 39 were amended by examiner's amendment in order to avoid any ambiguities regarding the "radial groove" in claims 1 and 39.